

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

DH

To:

Davies Collison Cave
Level 15
1 Nicholson Street
MELBOURNE VIC 3000

Resp Wo/Rle demand
due 5/1/06

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

6 APR 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference
12577060

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

International filing date (day/month/year)

4 March 2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

5 March 2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Int. Cl.⁷ G01R 31/3183

Applicant

VISION FIRE & SECURITY PTY LTD et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU

AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au
Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

JAMES WILLIAMS

Telephone No. (02) 6283 2599

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos: 27, 28

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos.

relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos.
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos.
are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 27, 28

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form ☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form ☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

Box No. V **Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 3,4,9,13,17-19	YES
	Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 16, 20-26,29-37	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims Nil	YES
	Claims 1-26,29-37	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-26,29-37	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Novelty

D1: WO 2003/048794

D1 discloses a method and apparatus for embedded built-in self-test of electronic circuits and systems.

A set of test vectors is established and after synchronisation is applied to an embedded electronic circuit via an IEEE 1149.1 bus. The resulting output vectors are analysed and results are obtained for diagnosis of the circuit.

The test is delayed by a predefined period so that stable results can be obtained.

D1 discloses all of the features of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 16, 20-26 and 29-37.

Inventive Step

D2: WO 2000/067164

D3: US 5,642,057

D2 discloses a method and apparatus for creating testable circuit designs having embedded cores by applying test vectors to the circuit design.

D3 discloses a testable embedded microprocessor where the embedded microprocessor is isolated and test vectors are applied that have already been developed for the stand-alone microprocessor.

The additional definition of the environment of the embedded system does not involve an inventive step over the cited prior art of D1. Therefore Claims 3, 4, 13 and 17 do not involve an inventive step.

The protocols defined in Claim 9 are well known in the art. Therefore Claim 9 does not involve an inventive step.

The logging of test results is a normal operation in testing and does not involve an inventive step. Therefore Claims 18 and 19 do not involve an inventive step.

D2 and D3 do not specifically disclose the use of predefined timing, this can however be taken from the disclosure of D1 and it would be obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine the teachings of D1 with either of D2 or D3. Claims 6, 8, 15-24, 29-37 do not involve an inventive step.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 27 and 28 have no identifiable features since the method, protocol, system, apparatus or device therein claimed are not specifically defined and hence contain any method, protocol, system, apparatus or device mentioned in the specification.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

27 FEB 2006

To: Davies Collison Cave Level 15 1 Nicholson Street MELBOURNE VIC 3000 <i>resp due: 27/4/06</i>		PCT WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 66)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 12577060/DH/gjm		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 27 FEB 2006 REPLY DUE within TWO MONTHS from the above date of mailing	
International application No. PCT/AU2005/000313	International filing date (day/month/year) 4 March 2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 5 March 2004	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC INT. CL. G01R 31/3183 (2006.01) ACTION DATE: 16 FEBRUARY 2006			
Applicant VISION FIRE & SECURITY PTY LTD et al			

1. ☒ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:

☒ is ☐ is not
 considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This **second** (second, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Box No. II Priority
 - ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the **Reply Due** date indicated above. However, the Australian Patent Office will not establish the Report before the earlier of (i) a response being filed, or (ii) one month before the **Final Date** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established. The Report will take into account any response (including amendments) filed before the Report is established. **If no response is filed by 1 month before the Final Date, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.**

Applicants wishing to have the benefit of a further opinion (if needed) before the report is established should ensure that a response is filed at least **3 months before the Final Date** by which the international preliminary examination report must be established.

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.
4. The **FINAL DATE** by which the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: **5 July 2006**

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU
 AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE
 PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA
 E-mail address: pct@ipaustalia.gov.au
 Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929

Authorized Officer

JAMES WILLIAMS
 Telephone No. (02) 6283.2599

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

Box No. I **Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ The international application in the language in which it was filed:
 - ☐ A translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
 - ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b))
 - ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4(a))
 - ☐ international preliminary examination (Rules 55.2(a) and/or 55.3(a))
2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*):
 - ☐ the international application as originally filed/furnished
 - ☒ the description: pages **1-32**, as originally filed/furnished
 - pages _____, received by this Authority on _____ with the letter of _____
 - pages _____, received by this Authority on _____ with the letter of _____
 - ☒ the claims: pages **33-38**, as originally filed/furnished
 - pages _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19,
 - pages **39-40**, received by this Authority on **22 December 2005** with the letter of the same
 - pages _____, received by this Authority on _____ with the letter of _____
 - ☒ the drawings: pages **1-3**, as originally filed/furnished
 - pages _____, received by this Authority on _____ with the letter of _____
 - pages _____, received by this Authority on _____ with the letter of _____
 - ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.
3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
 - ☐ the description, pages _____
 - ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
 - ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
 - ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).
 - ☐ the description, pages _____
 - ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
 - ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
 - ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
 - ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (*specify*): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/AU2005/000313

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 3,4,9,13,17-19	YES
	Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 16, 20-36	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES
	Claims 1-36	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-36	YES
	Claims	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Novelty

D1: WO 2003/048794

D1 discloses a method and apparatus for embedded built-in self-test of electronic circuits and systems.

A set of test vectors is established and after synchronisation is applied to an embedded electronic circuit via an IEEE 1149.1 bus. The resulting output vectors are analysed and results are obtained for diagnosis of the circuit.

The test is delayed by a predefined period so that stable results can be obtained.

D1 discloses all of the features of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 16, and 20-36.

Inventive Step

D2: WO 2000/067164

D3: US 5,642,057

D2 discloses a method and apparatus for creating testable circuit designs having embedded cores by applying test vectors to the circuit design.

D3 discloses a testable embedded microprocessor where the embedded microprocessor is isolated and test vectors are applied that have already been developed for the stand-alone microprocessor.

The additional definition of the environment of the embedded system does not involve an inventive step over the cited prior art of D1. Therefore Claims 3, 4, 13 and 17 do not involve an inventive step.

The protocols defined in Claim 9 are well known in the art. Therefore Claim 9 does not involve an inventive step.

The logging of test results is a normal operation in testing and does not involve an inventive step. Therefore Claims 18 and 19 do not involve an inventive step.

D2 and D3 do not specifically disclose the use of predefined timing, this can however be taken from the disclosure of D1 and it would be obvious to a person skilled in the art to combine the teachings of D1 with either of D2 or D3. Claims 6, 8, 15-24, 27-35 do not involve an inventive step.

Claim 36 does not involve an inventive step for the reasons given for claims 3 and 4.